

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

1. PROJECT TITLE  Organization and Administration of Integrated Rural Development	2. PROJECT NUMBER 936-5300	13. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE ST/RAD
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES		4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY: 81-36 8/6/81 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION

6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total: \$ 2,764 E. U.S. \$ 2,764	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) 7/78 To (month/yr.) 1/81 Date of Evaluation Review 3/81
--	---

E. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	E. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Amend project authorization to extend project from the end of FY 81 through the end of FY 84 and increase the total authorized funding from \$2,764,000 to \$3,294,000.	K. Kornher	10/81
2. Give preference to Caribbean in allocation of resources for short-term TA.	K. Kornher	Variable
3. Complete long-term TA field relationships with Egypt, Philippines, Pakistan, Niger, and Indonesia.	K. Kornher	Variable
4. Strengthen dissemination efforts.	K. Kornher	(1st Workshop) 5/82

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend Project Paper (PAF)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

Major

A.  Continue Project Without Change

B.  Change Project Design and/or Change Implementation Plan

C.  Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Kenneth Kornher  
Project Officer  
ST/RAD

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: *[Signature]*  
Typed Name: Jerome French, Director, ST/RAD  
Date: 8/6/81

## IRD PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES)

### 13. Summary

ST/RAD Project 936-5300, Organization and Administration of Integrated Rural Development, was evaluated at the mid-point of its four year projected life. The project contains a mix of technical assistance and research objectives with the overarching purpose of improving AID's integrated rural development projects. It is carried out by a contractor, Development Alternatives, Inc. of Washington, D.C. The technical assistance objectives center around the provision of advisory services for IRD to USAIDs in the areas of management, organization, planning, rural development, community development, finance and procurement. The research objectives focus upon the accumulation of a data base on the management of IRD, the analysis of that data to distill general applications, and the dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned.

The mid-term evaluation assessed not only the progress achieved by the contractor toward goals and objectives, but also larger questions of performance encompassing structural arrangements among ST/RAD, AID/W, and field missions. The evaluation found that the project had satisfactorily produced the following planned outputs: 1) The 10-country review of IRD projects, 2) the state-of-the-art paper, and 3) the consultant network. Progress toward achievement of the other outputs -- the IRD design manual and technical assistance to IRD field efforts -- was found to be on target. The evaluation recommended concentrating further TA on four or five particular projects, and emphasizing solutions to IRD problems in the completion of the manual. Problems were identified in knowledge dissemination efforts, maintenance of a balanced interdisciplinary focus in TA teams, and -- related to the larger questions -- ST/RAD's ability to pursue a knowledge-building agenda in the face of USAID mission sovereignty.

### 14. Evaluation Methodology

The mid-term evaluation for Project 5300 was carried out by an inter-bureau team comprised of one person from ASIA/TR, one from AFR/DR, and two from LAC/DR. The scope of the evaluation included consideration of ST/RAD - AID/W relationships as well as DAI's performance. The methodology used in this evaluation comprised interviews, questionnaires, and document review. A five-day field trip to Jamaica by the team to visit an IRD project assisted by DAI provided case study data on field activities.

15. External Factors

The evaluation focused explicitly on factors external to project performance in its attention to AID structural arrangements and their impact upon the achievement of project purpose. In looking at ST/RAD's operation, the evaluation raised questions about transfer of learning from the project to the Agency given the fact that approximately half of RAD's staff is non-direct hire. Similarly the practice of contracting with DAI to learn for AID was questioned.

The impact of the ST/RAD - mission relationship on the project's research agenda was examined. The evaluation expressed concern that because mission needs were treated as sovereign, ST/RAD is powerless to allocate project TA in order to maximize learning and must respond to the field occasionally to the detriment of research goals.

16. Inputs

Project inputs have been sufficient to maintain scheduled progress toward the delivery of the outputs planned. Technical assistance services have been provided through a combination of central funding and USAID mission contributions. Potential reductions in the budget for the project's second two years will have an impact on dissemination results, should cuts be implemented.

17. Outputs

The project has reviewed IRD management issues in ten countries, produced a state-of-the-art paper plus a continuous flow of working papers and research notes, and a network of consultants with expertise in various aspects of IRD management. Long-term field service relationships have been developed with three countries, and several more are in progress. The preparation of the IRD design manual is moving on schedule.

18. Purpose

The project purpose is "to improve the design and management of public programs which provide income production and social services to rural communities." While the attainment of such an objective is difficult to measure, the project has made progress through the outputs produced so far in identifying the parameters of IRD project effectiveness.

19. Goal

The project goal is "to reduce the number of rural poor whose basic needs have not been met." The interim evaluation did not include an assessment of goal attainment.

20. Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of this project are the personnel of the IRD field projects that have reviewed technical assistance from the contractor. The fruits of what has been learned from the research component of the project have been used in the field by designers and implementors of IRD projects. The indirect beneficiaries of the project are the intended target populations of these on-going IRD efforts; and, theoretically, future target populations of planned IRD projects.

21. Unplanned Effects

Not pertinent.

22. Lessons Learned

Organizing and administering IRD projects are complex processes that are not susceptible to "cookbook" management, yet project designers and managers are confronted with the responsibility to act in the face of uncertainty. The project has identified common threads in IRD efforts that are leading to the development of action-oriented steps to implement IRD that avoid cookbook prescription. Successful implementation of IRD involves creative solutions to nine critical problem areas: 1) effecting integration; 2) political, economic, and environmental constraints; 3) participation and decentralization; 4) information flows; 5) timing and sequencing; 6) differing agendas among critical actors; 7) managing technical assistance; 8) counterpart shortages; and 9) sustaining project benefits. Further elaboration and analysis of these areas continues as an integral part of the project's field service and applied research objectives.

Attachments:

ST/RAD distribution memo to evaluation report, July 30, 1981.

DATE : July 30, 1981

TO : See Distribution

FROM : ST/RAD, Kenneth Kornher *KK*

SUBJECT: Evaluation of ST/RAD Integrated Rural Development Project

Attached is the interim evaluation of the ST/RAD project on the Organization and Administration of Integrated Rural Development (IRD). Development Alternatives Inc. (DAI) is the contractor. The project contains a mix of technical assistance and research objectives with the overarching purpose of improving AID's IRD projects. The interim evaluation of this project was jointly sponsored by RAD and the regional bureaus. It was carried out by an inter-bureau team composed of one person from ASIA/TR, one from AFR/DR, and two from LAC/DR. The scope of the evaluation included an assessment not only of the progress achieved by the contractor towards goals and objectives, but also of larger questions of performance encompassing structural and operational arrangements among ST/RAD, AID/W, and field missions.

In dealing with the impact of AID's organizational environment on the project, the evaluation has raised useful issues regarding how the Agency seeks to build new knowledge into its operations. However, by couching its investigation in this wider framework, the evaluation emphasized factors other than the utility of specific outputs produced by the contractor. The evaluation team gave DAI good marks for performing well under difficult circumstances, although some project committee members feel this view does not emerge clearly from the report. Similarly, the report's recommendation not to extend the project beyond the scheduled termination date has been reconsidered; and the IRD project committee has voted to recommend a two-year extension at a low level of funding for FYs 83 and 84. This will allow the project to serve long-term field support and applied research needs in Egypt, the Philippines, Pakistan, Niger, and Indonesia; and thus the Agency will profit to the fullest extent from the substantial learning that has emerged, and continues to emerge, from this project. The evaluation has caused a significant re-examination of the knowledge dissemination issue and has helped to focus attention on this critical area in planning activities for the duration of the project including the proposed extension. Based on the preliminary views of the project committee and his own judgement, the ST/RAD project officer recommended extension, and this is reflected in the office's ABS for FY 83. Funding is provided in the FY 82 OYB (\$110,000) and the FY 83 ABS (\$200,000 at the current level).

It should be noted that this interim evaluation exercise has advanced the "state-of-the-art" of managerial and technical interaction between the regional bureaus and ST/RAD. For the members of the evaluation team, it required energy above and beyond that associated with the normal call of duty. The findings are thought-provoking and the effort is to be applauded. Any comments should be addressed to: Ken Kornher, ST/RAD, AID, SA-18, Washington, D.C. 20253.

DISTRIBUTION:

ASIA/PD: G.R. VanRaalte  
ASIA/DP: R. Halligan  
ASIA/BI: J. Norris  
PPC/PDPR: D. Caton  
PPC/PDPR: J. Atherton  
PPC/PDPR: T. Johnson  
PPC/PDPR: R. Blue  
LAC/DR: S. Brown  
LAC/DR: T. McKee  
LAC/DR: R. Castro  
AFR/DR: L. Holdcroft  
AFR/DR: C. Scherrer  
USAID/Niger: Jim Lowenthal  
USAID/Kathmandu: Bill Douglas  
USAID/Manila: Don Wadley  
USAID/Jakarta: Doug Tinsler  
NE/RD: P. Benedict  
USAID/India: John Westley  
USAID/Pakistan: Ron Curtis  
USAID/Dacca: Chuck Antholt  
USAID/Bangkok: Dave Bathrick  
USAID/Rangoon: David Merrill  
USAID/Colombo: James Brady  
USAID/Liberia: Peter Weisel  
USAID/Botswana: John Pielemeier  
USAID/Ecuador: Paul Fritz  
USAID/Honduras: Ralph Conley  
USAID/Panama: Frank Miller  
USAID/Cairo: John Roberts